

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the Applicants' representatives during the personal interview conducted on January 12, 2005. The Office Action of October 19, 2004 has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claim 5. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, because claim 5 is an independent claim, further clarification regarding this is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 16, 22, 32 and 39, and cancels claim 40 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 10-14, 19-21, 27-31 and 35 have been withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Accordingly, claims 1-39 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification, and rejected claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Although Applicant believes that one skilled in the art would understand the slit recited in claim 40, for the sole purpose of expediting the prosecution of this application, claim 40 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the objection and rejection. For the record, Applicant further notes that Webster's II dictionary defines a "slit" as a long narrow cut, tear, or incision.

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, 15, 22-24, 32-34, 36-37, and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,441,873); rejected claims 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ha (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,275); rejected claims 8-9, 16-18, 25-26 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. in view of Applicant's Related Art Figure 5. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 15, 22-24, 32-34, 36-37, and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Young et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a pixel electrode in one of the pixel regions on the first substrate, the pixel electrode having a slit therethrough and side edge portions, the side edge portions being bent; a common electrode on a second substrate, wherein an electrical field formed between the side edge portions and the common electrode has a lateral component for multiple domains within the pixel region during an operation...” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-4, 6-7, and 15, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 22 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 22 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a pixel electrode positioned on the second substrate in one of the pixel regions, opposing the common electrode, and including a slit therethrough and side edge portions, the side edge portions being bent toward the first substrate, wherein an electrical field formed between the side edge portions and the common electrode has a lateral component for multiple domains within the pixel region during an operation.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 and claims 23-24, which depend from claim 22, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 32 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 32 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a pixel electrode located on the inner surface of the second substrate in one of the pixel regions, the pixel electrode having a slit therethrough and further having a first portion a first distance from the common electrode and a second portion a second distance from the common electrode, wherein an electrical field formed between the side edge portions and the common electrode has a lateral component for multiple domains within the pixel region during an operation.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 and claims 33-34 and 36-37, which depend from claim 32, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 39 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 39 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a pixel electrode in one of the pixel regions on the first

substrate, the pixel electrode having a slit and at least two side edge portions, the two side edge portions being bent, wherein the two side edge portions are substantially symmetrical with reference to the slit; a common electrode on a second substrate, wherein an electrical field formed between the two side edge portions and the common electrode has a lateral component for multiple domains within the pixel region during an operation...” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 39 is allowable over the cited references. In addition, since Ha fails to teach or suggest the above cited feature of the claimed invention, the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ha is also traversed.

The rejection of claims 8-9, 16-18, 25-26 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. in view of Applicant’s Related Art Figure 5 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 8-9 are rejected over the combination of Young et al. and Applicant’s Related Art Figure 5. Applicant respectfully submits that since the teachings of Figure 5 do not cure the deficiencies of the primary reference, Young et al., claims 8-9 are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 16 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 16 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a pixel electrode in one of the pixel regions on the first substrate, the pixel electrode having a slit therethrough and side edge portions, the side edge portions being bent... wherein an electrical field formed between the side edge portions and the common electrode has a lateral component for multiple domains within the pixel region during an operation...” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 and claims 17-18, which depend from claim 16, are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 25-26 are rejected over the combination of Young et al. and Applicant’s Related Art Figure 5. Applicant respectfully submits that since the teachings of Figure 5 do not cure the deficiencies of the primary reference, Young et al., claims 25-26 are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 38 is rejected over the combination of Young et al. and Applicant's Related Art Figure 5. Applicant respectfully submits that since the teachings of Figure 5 do not cure the deficiencies of the primary reference, Young et al., claim 38 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496 - 7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: January 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant



Claim 38 is rejected over the combination of Young et al. and Applicant's Related Art Figure 5. Applicant respectfully submits that since the teachings of Figure 5 do not cure the deficiencies of the primary reference, Young et al., claim 38 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496 - 7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: January 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,


By _____
Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant